lands under the Bhadra Right Bank Channel?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—They are lands which have been resigned by the previous holders. There is no question of reservation.

Mr. V. V. IYER.—Is it not desirable to classify them and grant them for cultivation?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—The idea is to do so in the near future. There is a separate question on that matter.

Mr. V. VENKATASWAMI CHETTY.—When a raiyat improves his garden land by sinking wells at his own cost, are the Government justified in increasing the assessment?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—Government have not given orders to enhance the assessment in such cases. The rules in the Land Revenue Code are clear that improvements effected under certain circumstances should not be taxed. If, in any case, it has been done, the aggrieved party might appeal within one year after the re-settlement. Sometimes even time-barred applications have been entertained.

Mr. B. NARAYANA REDDY.—In the last Dasara Session a number of cases of enhancements were brought to the notice of the Government. Has any action been taken to give relief to the land-owners concerned?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—The local officials must be making enquiries into those cases now.

Mr. V. VENKATASWAMI CHETTY.—Are the Government aware that in the Kolar District, dry *bagayet* rates have been levied in many cases where wells were sunk by the landholders at their own cost?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—Even for the levy of assessment on dry *bagayet* lands, the Land Revenue Code lays down definite principles. If there be any individual cases of hardship, the local officials will surely remedy them if the cases are taken to their notice.

Atchkat of Major and Minor Tanks.

Q.—19. **Mr. M. RAME GOWDA** (Chintamani Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the extent of wet and *bagayet* lands irrigated by each major and minor tank in each taluk before re-survey;

(*b*) the extent of lands irrigated by the tanks at present;

(*c*) the number of tanks below which the extent has increased by bringing Government waste lands under cultivation and the number and extent of adjoining dry lands brought under wet cultivation and added on to the *atchkat*;

(*d*) whether all the tanks, whose *atchkat* has been increased owing to the conversion of dry lands into wet, hold sufficient water for raising wet crops in the entire *atchkat*?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. A. V. Ramanathan).**—

(*a*) to (*d*) It is not possible to collect the information within the time available.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—My object in putting the question was to make out that the Government should take action either to increase the capacity of the tanks or to reduce the *atchkat* since the landholders are put to considerable trouble and hardship at present.

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—It is to solve that trouble that a Government Order was issued on 23rd June 1927 stating specifically that, if so desired, the raiyats could get their wet lands converted into garden or dry. But the general feeling of the raiyats was against any such conversion. Some of them have stated that they would be satisfied if they could raise crops even once in 5 years. They did not want any re-classification to be made. Still, any raiyat who wants to get it done may apply for conversion.

Mr. M. RAME GOWDA.—If the crop is raised once in 5 years, will not the Government have to give remissions in 4 years out of the 5 and lose revenue?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—Let not that consideration bother the member. Let those who are affected apply and get the lands converted.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Are the Government aware which are all the

larger tanks under which the *atchkat* is more than the capacity of the tanks warrants?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—It is not possible readily to give that information because conditions are always changing.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Cannot the *atchkats* be reduced on the Government's own initiative without waiting for applications from the raiyats? The Government must be aware that due to silt accumulation, the capacity of tanks has been reduced in most cases.

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—These things are brought to the notice of the officers at the time of the annual inspections and at jamabandy time. Projects are prepared whenever necessary and work taken up wherever possible. It is not possible to do it in the case of all the 25,000 tanks all at once.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Are the Government receiving reports every year in this respect?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Yes.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—But why should *atchkats* be extended at all, indiscriminately?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—It is not done at all. In fact, the orders of Government are definitely against indiscriminate extensions.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—In the Nagamangala and Krishnarajapet Taluks, owing to failure of crops, the raiyats represented that they were unable to pay the assessments at the prevailing rates, and the Dewan was pleased to promise a reduction. Has anything been done in that direction?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I shall visit the places early and see what can be done.

Mr. K. P. CHANNABASAVIAH.—Cannot the Deputy Commissioner himself be empowered to reduce the assessment in deserving cases?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—No; the Deputy Commissioner cannot do it. Such cases must go first to the Director of Land Records and then to Government through the Revenue Commissioner, for final orders.

Frontier Toll-gates in Pavagada Taluk.

Q.—20. **Messrs. G. SANKARA SETTY and P. NAGARAJAIAH (Pavagada Taluk).**—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) are not the Government aware of the fact that frontier toll-gates in Pavagada Taluk are getting their income from the people of Pavagada Taluk alone as there is no direct traffic from the British territories to the State;

(*b*) is it not a fact that Pavagada cannot be a good commercial place and is mainly dependent upon Hindupur (British Territory) for all supplies to the market?

A.—**The GENERAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar).**—

(*a*) No. The total revenue at the gate is not derived solely from people of Pavagada Taluk.

(*b*) Government have no definite information.

Mr. G. SANKARA SETTY.—With reference to (*a*), may I know what percentage of the income is derived from the people of Pavagada?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—We have no information on that point. We can only say that all the income is not derived from that taluk.

Mr. G. SANKARA SETTY.—I know that more than 80 per cent of the income is realised from the local people. So, whatever concessions are allowed to people in other parts of the State who are similarly situated, might be shown to people in the Pavagada Taluk also, with regard to imports of food-stuffs and other necessities of life.

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—It is not possible to convert frontier toll-gates into interior toll-gates or to grant the exemptions proposed. Those toll-gates are governed by different rules.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM.—Was it not the intention that at frontier toll-gates, double rates should be recovered only on imports brought by outsiders?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No; the rule applies to all alike.